NORTH-SEMITIC EPIGRAPHY[1].

THE study of North-Semitic epigraphy, especially in this country, has sorely stood in need of the stimulus which Mr. G. A. Cooke's excellent handbook is calculated to afford. The great Paris *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* is costly, and the rate of publication is naturally slow; the Palmyrene inscriptions have not yet appeared, and although the other Aramaic and the Phoenician divisions are nearly completed, fresh inscriptions have been discovered which in not a few cases affect those which have already been edited, sometimes in the matter of interpretation, sometimes even as regards the readings. Professor Driver's notes in the Introduction to his *Hebrew Text of Samuel* were an admirable specimen of what was needed for younger students, but obviously they could not carry the beginner far. The present writer's *Glossary of the Aramaic Inscriptions*, as the title implies, was limited in its scope and barely covered one portion of the field, and it was left for Lidzbarski's fine *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik* to furnish the first general introduction to the inscriptions. The arrangement of the material, the complete bibliography, the comparative glossary of the Canaanite and Aramaic inscriptions, and the useful selection of texts render his work indispensable for advanced study[2], but, like the *Corpus*, it is scarcely the book to put

---

[1] *A Text-book of North-Semitic Inscriptions.* By the Rev. G. A. Cooke, M.A. (Clarendon Press).

[2] Needless to say, the *Handbuch* has been of the greatest assistance in these pages, particularly in the compilation of the material, pp. 272-7 below.

into the hands of the beginner. A preliminary text-book was wanted, and Mr. Cooke, who originally intended to provide a manual for students who offer the subject of Semitic Epigraphy in the Honour School of Oriental Studies at Oxford, wisely decided to appeal to a larger field. Here we have about 150 inscriptions, transliterated into Hebrew, translated, and admirably annotated; care has been taken to incorporate the most recent researches, and the discrimination which the author has shown in dealing with the copious material scattered throughout the various learned journals gives his work a lasting value. Primarily intended though it is for younger students, we have no doubt that Mr. Cooke's publication will, through the richness of its notes, be gladly welcomed by all Semitic scholars.

The inscriptions under consideration belong to the "North-Semitic" division. The term is a convenient one, but is not to be understood in a geographical sense alone, since "North-Semitic" inscriptions are found in Arabia and Egypt, and "South-Semitic" have been discovered south of Damascus and in the region east of Jordan. The term is used partly in a palaeographic and partly in a linguistic sense. The "South-Semitic" scripts, in which are written the inscriptions of the Minaeans and the Sabaeans, of Lihyan, Thamud and Ṣafa, separated at an early, though unknown, date from that ancestral alphabet, the parent of the North-Semitic and European forms, and are characterized by distinctive forms and by greater precision in the reproduction of the finer shades of utterance. As a linguistic term, "South-Semitic" includes Arabic and Ethiopic, and stands opposed to the "North-Semitic" which, with Wright, may be divided into three groups: Eastern (Assyrian and Babylonian), Central (Aramaean), and Western (Canaanite)[1]. Since Assyrian and Baby-

---

[1] Other groups have been suggested, but Wright's has istinct advantages and is eminently preferable to that which Mr. Cooke himself adopts (p. xvii and n. 1), apparently through a misunderstanding of Wright's words (*Comp. Gr.*, p. 12).

Ionian stand apart, it is the Canaanite and Aramaean inscriptions which come under consideration, and a brief survey of the material and characteristics of these two branches will afford some idea of what is meant by these rather conventional designations[1].

Of the Canaanite inscriptions by far the most important is the Moabite stone dating from the middle of the ninth century B.C. (No. 1)[2]. Entering, as it does, into Hebrew history it is the most interesting record yet discovered, and the literary ability with which it is marked is evident proof that the Moabites were well acquainted with the art of writing[3]. With the exception of a couple of seals, which bear names compounded with the god Chemosh, no other Moabite remains have as yet come to light. As regards Hebrew inscriptions, too, the material at present is lamentably scanty. The only one of any length is a six-lined text from the tunnel connecting the Pool of Siloam and the Virgin's Spring in Jerusalem (No. 2). A number of small specimens of Hebrew writing have been found in the shape of seals and pottery-marks, jar-stamps, &c., and are chiefly of value for Hebrew onomatology and palaeography[4].

[1] It will be recalled that the Hebrew square character has developed out of the Aramaic, from which source, also, are derived the Arabic forms. It is singular to find during the early centuries of the Christian era some Arabian tribes using an Aramaic script, others a South-Semitic, a descendant of the older Minaean and Sabaean; in the former the definite article in compound proper names is אל as in Arabic, in the latter ה ! See below, p. 271.

[2] The figures in heavy type refer to their position in Cooke's *Text-book*.

[3] It is a little astonishing that the belief has not yet died out that the stone after all may be a forgery. If this were so, it would be remarkable that אשוח (אֶשְׁוָּח?, אֶשִׁיּחַ, ll. 9, 23), evidently a pit or reservoir, has only recently been recovered (Ecclus. l. 3, see Cooke, p. 9).

[4] On p. xx. n. 2, מר[?שה] should be read ממשה. It is possibly the *Mampsio* (Μαψις) of the Onomastica (Lagarde, 85, 3; 210, 86), on the road from Elath to Hebron, one day's journey from *Thamara* (Hommel, *Expository Times*, xii. p. 288 [1901]). In the same note too, for · ·צפנאי read · · צפן·א, the dot or rather stroke (so in the original) appears to be a word-divider.

The vast majority of the Canaanite inscriptions are Phoenician, and with few exceptions have been found outside the mother country. They proceed from a definite and distinct branch of the Semites which, ever restless and energetic, pushed its colonies along the coasts of the Mediterranean, possibly as far as Spain itself. The oldest inscription of any length from Phoenicia proper is that of Yehaw-melek, king of Gebal (Byblus), of the fifth or fourth century B. C. (No. 3). Somewhat later are the Sidonian inscriptions of the dynasty of Eshmunazar (Nos. 4 sq., Appendix, pp. 401–3), whilst a few from Tyre, Umm el-'Awâmîd and Ma'sûb extend to the third and second (Nos. 8–10). Of greater antiquity, however, are the Baal-Lebanon, and the Hassan-bey-li[1] inscriptions, the former found at Cyprus, belonging to the time of Hiram (II)[2], the latter from N. Syria, west of Zenjirli, seems to be of about the same period. Cyprus has furnished a number of other interesting inscriptions (cp. Nos. 12–30) from the fourth century downwards, and some of these, written in Phoenician and Cypriote, were of great assistance in the decipherment of the latter character. The Phoenician inscriptions from Egypt (No. 31) have not been so numerous or important as the Aramaic.

Phoenician colonies in Greece (Athens, Piraeus, Nos. 32 sq.) have provided richer material, ranging from the fourth or third century to the first (96 B. C.). Malta and Sardinia have furnished a few distinctive finds chiefly of the second century, although two remarkable examples (Nos. 37, 41) on palaeographic grounds may even be four centuries older. From France come two tablets, probably of the fourth century B. C., one found at Avignon, the other, an extremely

---

[1] Edited by Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, I, pp. 305–9.

[2] No. 11 ; Mr. Cooke agrees with von Landau that Hiram II, mentioned by Tiglath-Pileser III (738 B.C.), and not the contemporary of David and Solomon, is meant. This is also the view of Ed. Meyer (*Encyc. Bib.*, col. 3753, n. 2), and is probably correct. Hence the famous bowl can no longer be cited as a specimen of the Phoenician character of the eleventh or tenth century.

important sacrificial tablet, at Marseilles (No. **42**). That these were actually inscribed in France by Phoenician merchants or colonists is far from certain. Carthage, and the northern coast of Africa (Tunis, Tripoli, Algeria) have furnished hundreds of remains, none, however, older than the fourth or third century, whilst the latest (the Neo-Punic) belong to the earliest Christian times.

Extending as they do over so many centuries, these inscriptions display numerous examples of modification. Not only does the script undergo remarkable change, but the orthography and the language does not remain fixed. Traces of separate dialects are found in the Byblus inscription, and in those from Hassan-bey-li, Larnax Lapethos, and Sardinia [1]. Foreign influence shows itself partly in the bilinguals, in the use of Greek, Cypriote, Latin, and Berber, and now and again in the general style of the inscription. A notable example of the latter feature appears in No. **33**, from Piraeus. As is frequently the case in the Aramaic inscriptions, the evidence of the proper names often suggests that the writers were foreigners, cp. Cleon (No. **40**), and see e.g. No. **52**, where the names appear to be Numidian.

As regards the general characteristics of the Canaanite inscriptions reference may be made to Mr. Cooke's remarks, pp. xix, 23 and *passim*. For the Hebrew student their grammatical and orthographical features are of the greatest interest, and on the assumption that no one knows anything of Hebrew who only Hebrew knows, the bearing of the inscriptions upon the study of Old Testament language and writing can scarcely be overestimated. Among the peculiarities of Phoenician may be noticed the use of כן "to be," never היה, and the construction כן נדר ; both the verb and the construction are reminiscent of Arabic, but naturally are not to be taken as evidence that Phoenician and Arabic were more closely related than Hebrew and

---

[1] See Cooke, p. 25 and note in No. 29 אז for נ, and in Nos. 39–41 the comparative frequency with which שׁ is used.

Arabic. Similarly, the Phoenician ערפת "portico" and
צועת a kind of sacrifice, admit of an explanation from Arabic
and Ethiopic respectively, and find their chief value in the
circumstance that they serve to indicate that the common
Canaanite language must have been considerably more
extensive than the vocabulary of the Old Testament by
itself would suggest. Phoenician, it may be mentioned,
carefully distinguishes between ירח "month" and חדש
" moon "; in Hebrew, on the other hand, they are confused.
It is rather singular, also, that the Hebrew prepositions
עם and מן have not as yet been found in Phoenician[1].
The construction הבמת זאת (never הבמת הזאת) is character-
istic of Phoenician and Moabite as distinguished from
Hebrew, where, however, it is not quite unknown[2]. The
spelling זאת in the Moabite stone (1. 3) agrees with the
Hebrew, but in Phoenician the corresponding form זת does
not appear until the period of the latest (the Neo-Punic)
inscriptions. On the other hand, it regularly employs ז for
both genders[3], although no doubt they were distinguished
in pronunciation[4].

---

[1] The Phoen. לד may correspond to the former (see p. 283, n. 3 below),
but whether (בן) answers to מן is not certain (Cooke, pp. 33, 35). As regards
the latter, at all events in 9 3 (בפלנ לאדך) the use of ב may find a parallel
in the *Poenulus* of Plautus ; *anno byn mytthymballe bechaedre anec* (Hannonen
esse ait Carthagine, Carthaginensis Muthumballis filium) appears to
represent : הנא בן מתנבעל בקרת[חדשת] אנך.

[2] See the passages cited by Driver on 1 Sam. xix. 10.

[3] Only in the Byblus inscription does the fem. זי occur, and it might be
suggested that זאת is a double feminine, and that זי and זו are earlier
forms. זת, however, is *not* confined to the feminine (p. 26), but as CIS i.
149, l. 3 sq. and other passages show, could be used for the masculine (cp.
Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, I, p. 44). The addition of ת finds parallels in the
Phoen. המת, the Sabaean הות, fem. הית, and in Ethiopic (Wright, p. 105).
It is therefore possible that the ת of the Hebrew זאת has a similar origin,
and has nothing to do with the feminine termination. The form in the
Poenulus of Plautus (*syth*) points to an older *zōth*, analogous to *chyl* = בל.
The evidence of Plautus is naturally to be used with caution, but these
interesting old fragments are important enough to have deserved some
notice in Mr. Cooke's *Introduction*.

[4] Wright (p. 108) conjectures *zĕ* and *zū*. The Hebrew *ō*, it should be men-
tioned, has passed over into *ū* in such spellings as the Punic *salus* (three), *rufe*

Moabite is characterized by the occurrence of a conjugation which is elsewhere found only in Assyrian and Arabic (הלתחם " to wage war "), the plural and dual ends in ן– as occasionally in Hebrew[1], whilst the Phoenician regularly has ם–. The language on the whole differs only dialectically from Hebrew, and although a few features associate it with Phoenician, these are outweighed by such usages as the Hiphil as opposed to the Iphil (see below) and by characteristic idioms and terms (see Cooke, p. 5).

As regards the orthography, too, Moabite is more closely related to Hebrew than to Phoenician, and in view of the question of the orthography of the earliest MSS. of the Old Testament, the subject is one of some interest. In the first place let us observe that both the Moabite stone and the only Hebrew inscription of length separate the words by means of a point[2]. In Phoenician, however, the inscriptions so marked are not the oldest, nor are they found in Phoenicia itself, but in Greece, Cyprus, and the west[3]. The Massoretic text contains indubitable instances of the incorrect division of words[4], but these may be due to the fact that the earliest MSS. were written in a script where these convenient guides were not in use. It is to be noticed that neither points nor any similar contrivances are used in Egyptian Aramaic (the words, however, are sometimes separated by spaces), nor do we meet with final letters before the period of the Nabataean inscriptions (middle of the first cent. B.C. and onwards).

In the next place, as regards the use of ו, י, א and ה, it is important to notice the leading features of the inscriptions. In the Siloam inscription, it is true, final ה is

(physician), alonuth (goddesses), rus (head), and notably suffet (שׁפֵּט). Note, on the other hand, ἀῤῥαβών = עֲרָבוֹן.

[1] Hence, the Old Testament examples are not necessarily Aramaisms.

[2] Similarly the Aramaic inscriptions of Zenjirli, but not the contiguous Phoenician inscriptions from Hassan-bey-li, or the Baal-Lebanon bowl. In the oldest Arabian inscriptions the words are divided by a line.

[3] Lidzbarski, Handbuch, p. 202.

[4] For examples, cp. Driver, Samuel, pp. xxx sqq.

represented in נקבה (boring), היה (to be), זה (this), &c., but
against this we have הית, which is presumably הָיָת rather
than הָיְתָה (p. 16 sq.). Final י and ו appear in כי and וילכו
in conformity with Moabite as opposed to Phoenician.
Ordinary long *ī* and *ō* are not represented (e.g. הֹצִבָם,
אמֹת &c.), and the spellings עוד and מוצא suggest that these
retained the older pronunciation עַוְד and מַוְצָא. On the
other hand, in the two exceptions קל and ים, the vowel,
whatever its origin (קַוְל, יַוְם?), was probably heard as *ō*.
The question, however, remains uncertain. Noteworthy
also are the spellings ראש, מאתים in the Siloam inscrip-
tion, compared with the Moabite מאתן and צאן on the
one hand, and רש (head), and רית (? gazing-stock √ראה) on
the other. Obviously א, at least, was never written unless
it retained some consonantal force.

There are certain spellings in the Moabite stone which
deserve consideration. The ordinary long *ō* and *ī* are not
marked (שְׁלֹשָׁן, עלֹם), hence דיבן is probably דַּיְבֹן rather than
דִּיבֹן, and in the names חורנן, דודה, ו is probably diphthongal.
Comparing ביתה (1. 25) with בתה (1. 7), שעריה (1. 22) with ימה
(1. 8), it is open to suppose that the vowel is *é*, and, if this
be so, we must pronounce the Phoenician duals שנם, מאתם
with *ém* (cp. Heb. שְׁנַיִם) and treat the Moabite מאתים as a
plene spelling. If, however, we may conjecture that even
a diphthong could be omitted, we may point to the North-
Arabian inscriptions from Ṣafa, where such spellings as אס
(*aus*, also אום), אנף (*unaif*) and שעהקם (Nabataean שיעאלקום)
recur[1]. Another difficult letter in the Moabite stone is the
final ה (קרחה, 1. 3; דודה, 1. 12; לילה, 1. 15). It is not the
feminine, since this is regularly ת–. Wright (p. 139) sug-

---

[1] It may be added that in ובר אן בקרב הקר (1. 24), Mr. Cooke understands
אֵין (Gen. xlvii. 13), but אֵן (אֵין) is possible on the analogy of 2 Kings xix. 3.
The verbal form הִשִּׁעֵנִי (1. 4) is curious enough to have deserved remark. Was
it pronounced הִשִּׁעֲנִי or הַוְשִׁעֵנִי? The name Hoshea is always written
הושע on Hebrew seals, but whereas the king is called *a-u-si-'* in an inscrip-
tion of Tiglath-Pileser III, in a bilingual Aramaic docket (*c.* 680 B. C.),
הושע is represented by *u-si-'*.

gests, in the case of קרחה, that it represents an ending *â'u* ;
this, perhaps, does not suit לילה, perhaps originally לילי
(cp. Syr. ܠܝܠܝܐ), but that ה has some consonantal force, at
all events, appears tolerably certain.

The Moabite use of the final י and ו as a vowel letter
(cp. Siloam, כי, וילכו) is contrary to Phoenician. כי "for"
is regularly כ, and it is not until the period of the Neo-
Punic inscriptions that the vowel is indicated [1]. The plural
construct in י (כלאי, לפני 1 13, 23) is not marked in old
Phoenician, only Punic and Neo-Punic use א- or ע-[2]. The
plural ים-, too, is only found in Neo-Punic. With the
Moabite השעני (l. 4 "he saved me") contrast the Phoenician
פעלתן ("she made me"), with בנתי, בנה (ll. 18, 21, "he,
I built") contrast בנת, בן [3]. The 1st sing. suffix of the noun,
however, is regularly represented in both.

As regards the evidence of Hebrew seals, pottery stamps,
&c., the following details may be noticed : אבגיל (Massoretic
Text אביגיל), אברם, אבשדי (never אבי'), אדנשע ; אליעם (Clermont-
Ganneau, No. 44), otherwise always אל' (אלאמץ, אלשע, &c.) ;
זמריהו &c. (only once יה in חניה [?], Levy 3 = Vogüé 36) ;
the *plene* חורץ seems to be exceptional. חברן is written
defectively on the pottery stamps from the Shĕphĕlah ; on
the other hand cp. זיף and שוכה, where, however, the LXX
ζειφ (but also ζιφ) and the modern name *esh-Shuweikeh* may
suggest that the spellings Zīph and Sōcōh are not original [4].
It is perhaps sufficient to have recorded some of the more
important orthographical peculiarities of the Canaanite

[1] Viz. כע, כה, כא. On the use of the gutturals, see Cooke, p. 140. Note in
Phoen. בֶּן "they built," יִזְבַּח "they sacrifice," פֵּר "fruit," לְמַעַל "above,"
שְׁמֹן, "eight," שָׂר "field."

[2] The only exceptions in Aramaic are old : אלה (62 2, but אלהי, l. 22),
מאן (65 6)

[3] Hence the Moabite אנך does not stand for אנכי (in Phoenician, only
in graffiti from Egypt).

[4] *Plene* spellings in old Aramaic inscriptions are found certainly in
קדמה, ים, בנית, היצבה, בית (ibid., l. 3), whether in תגלתפליסר (ibid., l. 3), whether in אשור (63 9),
(Lidz., *Ephem.*, I, 82) is doubtful. For the evidence from the later
Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions (e. g. אנוש, תדמור, &c.), see below,
276, n. 1.

inscriptions, obviously a complete discussion of them in connexion with the Massoretic Text would be out of place[1].

It has already been observed that Moabite agrees with Hebrew in the use of the Hiphil (השעני &c.). In Phoenician the ה is replaced by י (יקדש, יטנא, &c.), and it is only in Neo-Punic that we find the form העלא[2]. The view that י is a *spiritus lenis*, a weakening of the older ה (p. 58), is difficult on account of the later Neo-Punic form just cited, and it would seem preferable to allow the י to retain its consonantal force, and to pronounce *yiḳdīš* (or *yaḳdīš*), rather than *iḳdīš*. One other point which calls for notice is the form of the suffix of the third sing. masc.: Moabite ה, Phoen. ‑י, later ‑א, and Neo-Punic ‑יא. ה‑ seems to appear also in the Hassan-bey-li inscription, but only in that of Yeḥaw-melek of Byblus do we meet with ‑ו (also verbal, תחוו l. 9), fem. ה‑ (p. 25). Mr. Cooke has strong support when he explains ‑י as a contraction of an original *-aḥi* (p. 42), the Moabite ה‑ from *-aḥu = -au = -ō* (p. 8), and the plural suffix in דברי " his words," from [דְּבָרָי[ו or דְּבָרֵי (p. 104, cp. תַּנְמוּלוֹהִי, Ps. cxvi. 12). It seems better to derive all three from *-iḥu* (*-iḥi*[3]), comparing the Hebrew אוֹרְהוּ, לְמִינֵהוּ • (dual or plur. יָדֵיהוּ, עֵינָיהוּ, גְּבוּרֹתֵיהוּ). If so, the Moabite and Phoenician forms should be pronounced אַרְצֹה, קֹלֵי, and דברֵי. The not unfrequent examples of the masc. ה‑ in the Old Testament may also be similarly viewed: עִירֹה and סוּתֹה (Gen. xlix. 11) should be עִירֵה and סוּתֵה, and the Massoretic punctuation, under these circumstances, must date from a time when the older use had been forgotten. It is important to notice that פילנשהו (Judg. xix. 24) contrasted with פילנשו (ver. 25) shows that both forms could be used side by side[4].

---

[1] We may, however, note the confusion of כי and כ in Judg. xvi. 25; Ezek. vii. 9 (כרכיך, see verse 4); Ps. lxix. 17, cix. 21 (כי טוב).

[2] The late proper names מיל, מיקם, may be Iphil participles (Lidzb.).

[3] This, the genitive form, appears to underlie the Aramaic *-eh* (Wright, p. 155), which is quoted by Cooke on p. 42 in support of the original form *-aḥi*.

[4] Cp. אהנו, לבשו, Gen., l.c. See, further, *Proceedings of Soc. of Bibl.*

Turning next to the Aramaic inscriptions we may observe that they are not, like the Phoenician, the work of a distinct branch of the Semites, nor do they admit of being classified with such precision as was the case with the Canaanite. Apart from Syriac proper, the language spoken around Edessa, a literary language, the Aramaic dialects fall into a number of divisions whose earlier history is clouded in obscurity. It is sufficient here to mention Jewish Aramaic, the dialect of the Targums, the later Christian-Palestinian (or Palestinian-Syriac)[1], the Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud, the Mandaean, and to these we must add the dialects of the Aramaic portions of Ezra and Daniel, and of the inscriptions.

It is known from Isa. xxxvi. 11, 2 Kings xviii. 26, that Aramaic was used in diplomatic intercourse between Assyrians and Israelites in the time of Hezekiah; the inscriptions will show us that these were by no means the only people who found the language more serviceable than their own. The oldest remains are those from Zenjirli in North Syria (Nos. 61–63), and date from the eighth century. Although written in a script, closely resembling that of the Moabite stone, it is important to observe that a very gradual modification can be observed in the shapes of certain letters (ז, מ, ס, ק, see Plate XIII), a clear indication of the early development of the Aramaic alphabet[2].

Archaeology, 1903, p. 39 sq., on the forms בה, שמה in the Nash papyrus (cp. *J. Q. R.*, 1902, p. 395, ll. 9, 11). The curious ויקדשיו (ibid., l. 16), it may be added, seems to find support in the Phoen. יברכי (יברכא) " may he (they) bless him." If so, we must pronounce ויקדשֵיו, the י is a consonant, and not a *plene* spelling as in שָׁלֵיו (Job xxi. 23). That the א in the Phoen. יברכא retained some guttural force seems to follow from its being used with the imperf. plu. (above).

[1] On its geographical distribution ('Abûd, between Judaea and Samaria in the seventh, and Antioch in the eleventh century), see Burkitt, *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, II (1901), p. 181.

[2] To these inscriptions we must now add that of Kalammu son of Ḥayan (Šanda, "Die Aramäer," *Der alte Orient*, IV, Heft 3, pp. 12, 26), which is said to belong to the time of Shalmaneser II (859–825 B. c.). This inscription, which appears to explain an obscure phrase in No. 63 17, has not yet been edited.

From Nerab, in the neighbourhood of Aleppo, come two small but extremely interesting inscriptions, probably of the seventh or sixth century (Nos. 64, 65).

The finds from Assyria and Babylonia are numerous. A few bronze lion-weights (No. 66) have Assyrian inscriptions, and since they bear the names of the kings Shalmaneser, Sargon or Sennacherib, admit of being dated with tolerable certainty. Somewhat later are a number of contract-tablets, most of which are Assyrian with Aramaic legends; those from Assyria belong chiefly to the seventh century, the Babylonian to the sixth and fifth. Passing over seals, bowls, &c., we need only mention a bilingual from Telloh of the third or second century in Aramaic and Greek (הדדנדאח, ἀδαδναδιναχης)[1].

From Limyra comes another bilingual in Greek and Aramaic of the fifth or fourth century, and elsewhere in Asia Minor a few scattered inscriptions have been found, one of the most interesting being from Saraïdin in Cilicia (No. 68), where a young huntsman places on record the fact that he was making a meal there. The recently published inscriptions from Cappadocia should also be mentioned[2], if only in the hope that scholars acquainted with Persian may turn their attention to them.

Aramaic would appear to have been frequently used in Egypt during the Persian period. A stone inscription, dated in the fourth year of Xerxes (482 B.C., No. 71), is of particular importance on this account for the history of Aramaic palaeography, and to this we may now add a papyrus, recently edited by Euting, of the fourteenth year of Darius (II. Nothus, i. e. 411–410 B.C.). Among the other finds of Egyptian origin are to be mentioned the ostraka from Elephantine, and the Oxford papyrus which Mr. Cooke was able to insert in his Appendix (pp. 404–6)—an interesting illustration of the progress of Semitic epigraphy.

---

[1] One recalls the Greek-Babylonian fragments edited by Pinches, in the *PSBA*, 1902, pp. 108–19, perhaps of the second century.

[2] Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik*, I, pp. 59–74, 319–26.

Têma, in Egypt, furnishes one old Aramaic inscription of the sixth or fifth century (No. 69), and a few others of descending date, among them one of particular interest for its close palaeographic resemblance to the bilingual from Telloh (No. 70). From Ḥejra come a number of small legends extending down to the second century B. C., chiefly noteworthy for the steady modification of the script to the form assumed upon the Nabataean inscriptions. The last-mentioned constitute a distinct palaeographic class, and to judge from the proper names were largely due to Arab-speaking tribes. A few have even been found in Italy (Puteoli, Rome)[1]—the work of travelling merchants—one at Sidon, and one as far north as Ḍomêr (No. 97), but by far the greater number were found in the Ḥaurân, and in the district of Ḥejra. Those from Ḥejra are grave-inscriptions, and form one of the most important contributions to our knowledge of Aramaic. In addition to this, they are tolerably connected pieces of writing, and those who desire to obtain a grounding in Aramaic epigraphy will find these inscriptions the simplest to commence with. A small group of inscriptions have been found also at Petra, two of which are of considerable importance (Nos. 95 sq.).

Palmyra, the ancient Tadmor, has provided a great number of inscriptions, quite distinct from the Nabataean, as regards palaeography, the general character of the contents, and, to some extent at least, the language. These, too, are chiefly due to Arabs, although apart from the proper names the Arabisms are not so pronounced as in the Nabataean. Many of these, notably the Tariff of Palmyra (No. 147), are bilingual (Palmyrene and Greek). Finally, as a palaeographic subdivision of the Nabataean, we must include the inscriptions from the Sinaitic Peninsula, consisting of hundreds of rude graffiti scratched upon the rocks by traders. Mr. Cooke's selection (Nos. 103–109) contains

[1] No. 102 and CIS ii. 157. The latter a bilingual in Latin and Nab. was erected by *Abdaretas* (צבדרתת) of Petra.

the more interesting examples, and illustrates the extent
to which Aramaic enters into them. With rare exceptions
the names are entirely Arabic, but the phrases ("blessed,"
"hail," "son," &c.) are Aramaic, and one meets with such
noteworthy combinations as "Hail (שׁלם) ! Garm-al-ba'li,
son (בר) of Ibn-Alḳaini ; good luck (בטב) [1]." The article
אל, as in the names just cited, agrees with the Arabic,
whilst it is rather remarkable that in the inscriptions
from Ṣafa, written in a North-Arabian script, it is regularly
ה [2]. A few graffiti of the same character as the Sinaitic
were recently discovered in Egypt in the Wâdy Gadammeh,
NE. of Keneh [3].

The extensive use of Aramaic by people other than
Aramaeans is reflected in the language of the inscriptions.
From the evidence of the proper names alone we are able
to recognize the presence of Assyria and Babylonia, Persia,
Egypt, Arabia, Greece and Rome. Assyrian influence
appears notably in the Zenjirli inscriptions, and in the
lion-weights and contracts ; it has even been suspected in
the old inscription from Têma [4]. Persian seems to appear
upon seals in such names as מתרצתר, ארתדת, פרשׁנדת, in such
words as [א]סתודנה "sepulchre," in the Palmyrene ארגבטא,
and especially in the Cappadocian inscriptions referred to
above. In Egyptian-Aramaic, in addition to Persian,
Egyptian words are taken over (תחפי, חסתמה, מנחא and fem.
תמנחא), and to the presence of Jews we probably owe such
Hebraisms as אישׁ "man" and לקח "take." Arabisms
appear notably in the Nabataean inscriptions, viz. the

[1] CIS ii. 787, cp. No. 104.

[2] Thus the Nab. שׁיעאלקום appears in Ṣafa as שׁעהקם 140 B. 4 ; see Lidzbarski,
Ephemeris, II, p. 36 sq.

[3] To be published in an early number of the *Proceedings of the Society of
Biblical Archaeology.*

[4] e. g. Tiglath-pileser "lord of the four parts of the earth" (62 14,
63 4) ; מנה מלך or מ' וי מלך = מ'=*mana ša šarri* (66), סנב=*sinibu* "half" (CIS ii.
No. 7, but פרשׁ in No. 10) ; רנת = *dannitu* (ibid., 17 sqq.) "document" ;
see also Cooke on 69, ll. 13 and 18 (where רבת, second line, is a
misprint).

construction מן יזבן for מן די יזבן, the precative perfect, the use of לען "curse," רהן, שלו, &c. (see note on No. 80 6), and the conjunction פ (found, however, in the Zenjirli inscriptions). Technical Greek and Latin terms predominate in Palmyrene (p. 264 sq.).

Considering the history of these Aramaic inscriptions it is not surprising that they reveal numerous traces of dialectical variation. Mr. Cooke's helpful notes (especially pp. 184 sq., 264 sq.) will give the reader some idea of their characteristics. The following supplementary remarks may, however, be added. In the oldest series, the Zenjirli inscriptions, it is important to distinguish between the latest, that of Bar-Rekub (No. 63), and the earliest, that of Hadad (No. 61). The former is essentially Aramaic and tolerably straightforward, the latter is most marked by non-Aramaic elements and is extremely obscure: the Panammu stone (No. 62) comes midway as regards intelligibility and philological phenomena. Whether the peculiarities are due to the mixture of dialects or to the gradual introduction and growth of Aramaic may be left an open question, at the least the endeavour must be made to avoid confusing features which are regular in Old Aramaic with those which are confined to one or more of these inscriptions alone. Of the forms and usages characteristic of Aramaic, as cited by Mr. Cooke, אנה " I," כרסא " throne [1]," רברבן " great " (plur.), and the emphatic form are found *only* in No. 63. The best examples with Canaanite analogies are to be found in No. 61 (אנך " I," חקק, זר, זכר, חרא, and the infinitive without prefixed מ), to a less degree in No. 62 (e. g. אנכי " I "), and scarcely once in No. 63. The Canaanite נם and לקח occur in Nos. 61, 62, the Aramaic חד " one " and בר " son " in all three [2]. It is a characteristic feature

---

[1] Also Phoenician, No. 15 2.

[2] It may be noticed as an instance of the facility with which foreign words may be adopted that the Aramaic בר is used even in the pre-Mohammedan Arabic inscription found by Dussaud at en-Nemārā (cp. Lidz., *Ephem.*, II, 35).

of No. 61 that the masc. plural ends in ־י [1], and that this is merely a case of apocope of ־ן seems to be rendered doubtful by the fact that the fuller plural is ־ן and never ־ין [2]. It is equally characteristic that the fem. plur. in ־ת [3] appears only in No. 62, and that cohortative ל is prefixed to the imperfect in No. 61. The forms in ־י, which are more frequent in No. 61 than in No. 62, are obscure; they are possibly abstract nouns since the suffix 3rd sing. masc. is regularly ־ה (but note אבוהי, אבוה and even אבה).

The consonantal equations are not entirely peculiar to this group. ק for ע (= Heb. צ) is best known from the form ארקא "earth" (Jer. x. 11) which is found in inscriptions of the sixth century and later [4]; but even in No. 61 30 we find צר (? i. q. עָר Dan. iv. 16), where this law would have led us to expect קר. צ for the normal ט appears only in No. 63 19 (כיצא) and one of the Nerab inscriptions (No. 64 12). שׁ for ת soon seems to have died out: in the inscription from Cilicia (fifth or fourth century), in the Têma inscription, and in Egyptian-Aramaic the forms אתרא "place," מיתב "seat," and תמה "there," are in agreement with the ordinary Aramaic usage. On the other hand, ז for ד was tenaciously retained (p. 185, note 1) down to the coins of Mazdai (fourth century) [5] and the Cappadocian inscriptions already referred to.

---

[1] But קדם אלהי No. 62 23, and שׁבעי (constr. state?) ibid., l. 3. The latter finds an analogy in Sabaean usage.

[2] ־ן, however, in lion-weights (מנין, also מנן), and later in Nab. and Palm. inscriptions.

[3] The reading קירה in No. 61 10 is not quite certain.

[4] The occurrence of the form in the Cappadocian inscriptions (Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, I, p. 323, l. 3), shows that it was in use two or three (or more) centuries later. That the ὁμόρκα of Berossos stands for אֶסִיאַרְקָא (Gunkel, Zimmern) is not generally accepted; see King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, I, p. xlvi note. To illustrate the equation, mention may be made of Halévy's ingenious suggestion that the form of the ק was originally derived from the circle ע by the addition of a stroke, but see Lidzbarski's criticisms, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

[5] The early exceptions שׁמשׁעדרי (CIS ii. 87), הדעדר and אכדבן (No. 150 2, 3) are doubtful.

The close relation between the inscriptions and the Ara-
maic portions of Ezra (fourth century?) and Daniel (early
second) is of considerable importance. Apart from the more
frequent use of the construct state, there are several linguistic
features of interest which call for remark. The use of ה
where the later Aramaic uses א is noticeable in such words
as אנה " I," הן " if," and especially in the causative and re-
flexive conjugations. As regards the causative forms, the
older inscriptions (including Eg.-Aram.) regularly use ה–,
Nabataean (with the exception of הקים, No. **97** col. 1) and
Palmyrene equally regularly א–; in Biblical Aramaic ה– pre-
ponderates. For the reflexive forms, No. **63** 14 presents ה–,
No. **65** 4 (probably) א–, and the latter is usual in Egyptian-
Aramaic, Palmyrene and apparently Nabataean; in Biblical
Aramaic, the forms with א occur only in Daniel. Older
forms are preserved in איתי (Nab.), אנפוהי Dan. ii. 46 (cp.
אנפי No. **69** 14), אנחנה Ezr. iv. 16, תמה (? No. **75** 2); sus-
pected Hebraisms prove to belong to the genuine Aramaic
stock [1], and in two cases an incorrect division of words can
be remedied [2]. The difficult use of יהב in Ezr. v. 16 finds
support in No. **102** 6, and the papyrus of Darius II (p. 269
above) not only mentions among officials the דיניא (Ezr. iv. 9)
and תיפתיא (Dan. iii. 2), but contains the interesting phrase
אזד יתעבד (cp. Dan. ii. 5, 8).

To supplement the remarks upon the Palmyrene inscrip-
tions (p. 264 sq.), it may be observed that the dialect in
several respects is younger than Nabataean (not to mention
Egyptian-Aramaic, &c.). In one or two instances it agrees
with the Aramaic of Daniel whilst the Nabataean finds
analogies in Ezra. The best example is the suffix of the
3rd plur. masc. which in Ezra, Nabataean and older
Aramaic is הם– (defective), but in Daniel, Palmyrene,

---

[1] e. g. אנוש (in Nab.) אל (but only in **61**; it occurs, however, in Pahlavi,
Nöldeke, *GGA*, 1884, No. 26, pp. 1014 sqq.). אנחנה is cited from the Eg.-
Aram. papyrus of Darius II.

[2] כל קבל, as לקבל (**67**, &c.) shows, must be read as one word, and for הא כדי,
Dan. ii. 43, we should read האך די, cp. Palm. היך די (Schulthess, *ZATW*,
1902, p. 164 sq.).

Jewish-Aramaic, &c. הון‎–[1]; the inscriptions regularly keep the forms distinct and on this account the occurrence of הון‎– in Ezra can scarcely be original[2]. Further, אלה‎, Ezr. v. 15 (keth.), agrees with Nabataean, whereas אל‎, the regular Palmyrene form, corresponds with the אל(י)ן‎[3] of Daniel. Occasionally, also, the ḳĕrî marks a later stage in the language which we are able to check by means of the inscriptions. Thus in Dan. iv. 16 מראי‎ "my lord," with א‎ agrees with the older inscriptions (including Nab.), whilst מָרִי‎ (kĕrî) is in conformity with Palmyrene and the later forms (e. g. Syriac)[4]. In Dan. iv. 13, the ḳĕrî אנשא‎ is in agreement with Palmyrene and later Aramaic, the Nabataean alone has אנושא‎. The lack of a special feminine form for the 3rd plur. perfect and nominal suffix (which is supplied by the ḳĕrî, e. g. Dan. v. 5 נפקו‎, ḳ. נפקה‎; ii. 33 מנהון‎, ḳ. מנהין‎) finds its parallel in Nabataean as distinguished from later usage[5].

The following examples of the difference between the Palmyrene and the Nabataean (and older inscriptions) may be noticed: גוח‎, "loculus" for a corpse (Targ. כוך‎), regularly in Nabataean, Palmyrene ג[ו]מח‎ (No. 91 5). אסרתגא‎ in No. 96 2, a rare instance of a Greek loan-word in Nabataean, Palmyrene transliterates with more precision אסטרטג‎ (στρατηγός)—the latter agrees with later Jewish and Syriac; on the various Nabataean forms, reference may be made to Lidzbarski, *Handbuch*, p. 222, or my *Glossary*, p. 23.

---

[1] Palm. rarely הן‎–, Jerus. Targ. also הום‎– (Dalman, *Gramm.*, p. 162).

[2] Cp. a similar unnatural confusion in Jer. x. 11 (ארקא‎ and ארעא‎).

[3] In this and in similarly cited words (e. g. Pal.-Syr. א[ת]נ‎), the bracketed letter indicates a variant form, thus in Dan. both אלן‎ and אלין‎ occur, in Pal.-Syr. both אתא‎ and אתחא‎.

[4] With the kĕthîb באישתא‎, Ezr. iv. 12, cp. retention of א‎ in Nos. 65 9, 75 2.

[5] With the Haphel inf. להחויה‎, להשניה‎ (Dan. ii. 10, vi. 9, kĕrî אה‎–, Strack), cp. Eg.-Aram. השקיא‎, היתיה‎. In Palm. the only examples of an infin. (outside the Pe'al) are אחבורא‎ (cp. Jew.-Aram., Dalman, p. 227) and מתחשבו‎. With the older חטיא‎ (Ezr. vi. 17, kĕrî חטאה‎), the Nab. חטיאה‎ "penalty" (CIS ii. 224 11) may be compared.

T 2

צדק " righteous " in old Aramaic, in Nabataean only in
a legal sense (No. 82 3) ; Palm. uses זדק as in Syr. (Pal.-
Syr., however, צדק). The fuller form מנדעם " some-, any-
thing " (with plur. מנדעמתא in Eg.-Aram.) becomes מדעם,
a stage nearer the Syr. مَدَّم. The Nab. זמן " time " agrees
with Bibl.-Aram., the Palm. זבן with later Aram.   ראש
(" head," "principal," p. 406) drops א in Palm.   אנתתא
" woman, wife," frequent in Nab., is shortened in Palm.
to אתתא (also, but rarely, in Nab.), and even איתא, אתא ;
obviously a popular pronunciation (cp. Pal.-Syr. את]א[).
The older תנה " here," takes the form תנן in Palm. in
agreement with Syr. تَنْ. תרתין " two " (fem.) becomes
חרתן ; for מן בר " except," Palm. has בר מן, and for דכרון
" memorial " (only Nab.), Palm. employs דכרן (once in Nab.).
As regards the last-mentioned example, we may compare on
the one hand, דִּכְרוֹנָה Ezr. vi. 2 and Pal.-Syr. דכרון]י[ד, and
on the other, דָּכְרָנַיָּא Ezr. iv. 15 and Syr. ܕܘܟܪܢܐ [1].

א becomes ה in דה " this " (fem.)—note for Nab. דא נפשא,
Palm. נפשא דה. Conversely, ה becomes א in חדא " one,"
מא " what," חטא " wheat." It is only in Palm. that the
plural suffix יהו- appears as וה- (except No. 62 2) ; יהוון
" they shall be " as די דיהון ; as ד, and the plural emphatic
יא- as א-. The use of שׂ to represent שׁ, as in Biblical
Aramaic (כשׂדיא, but כסדיא Ezr. v. 12), is regular in old
Aramaic ; ס probably occurs once in Eg.-Aram. (תסהדא),
otherwise only in Palmyrene, where, apart from the reten-
tion of שׂ in בשׂימא, ערשׂא, עשׂר, עשׂביא, we meet with סמל
" left," סהד " witness " and סגי " many," by the side of שׂני.

The general relation of the dialects of the inscriptions to
Aramaic generally is an interesting inquiry into which
space forbids me to enter. That they stand more closely
akin to Western Aramaic than to the literary Edessene
Syriac is not surprising when we consider their popular
character. What can be culled from Jewish-Aramaic may

---

[1] With the exception of Nab. בלחד CIS ii. 209 7 for בלחוד (twice), examples
of variation in the use of ו and י are found only in Palm. (בג]ו[ריא, אגנ]ו[ח,
ד]י[נר, תדמ]ו[ר, לגינ]ו[נא).

be seen in Dalman's *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, here I propose to notice a few examples of Palestinian-Syriac analogies. The examples from the inscriptions, unless otherwise indicated, are Palmyrene, and for the sake of clearness Palestinian-Syriac forms are transliterated in Hebrew.

As regards consonantal interchanges, the old Aram. צדק (above) is found also in Pal.-Syr., (Edessene) Syr. ܙܕܩ; with קשט (verb, p. 311), compare P.-S. קושטא, but contrast Syr. ܩܘܫܬܐ. As regards nominal forms :—Old Aramaic מיתבא (No. 70 1) = P.-S. מיתובא, Syr. ܡܘܬܒܐ (? cp. Nab. מותב No. 80 4); Nab. and Palm. מקברתא (p. 242), so P.-S., but Syr. ܩܒܘܪܬܐ; מיתויתא (No. 121 2), so P.-S., but Syr. ܡܝܬܝܬܐ[1]; תשמישא (p. 337), so P.-S.; but Syr. ܬܫܡܫܬܐ. The Nab. שארית (No. 94 3) and כפל "double" are used in P.-S. (note שיריתא, Schwally, *Idioticon*, p. 95), but not in Syr. שריתא (No. 117 4) "beam," so in P.-S., in Syr. with a different nuance. The Nab. and Palm. כות agrees with P.-S., but Syr. ܐܟܘܬ, ܗܟܘܬ; and for the Palm. בן וכות cp. the passages cited by Schwally, p. 44. With בדיל די (p. 266), cp. P.-S. לבדיל ד, for which Syr. uses ܡܛܠ (also in Palm., but not in P.-S). ביני . . . לביני, so in P.-S. (see Schwally, p. 11). In No. 121 4, אחי finds analogies in P.-S., but לכא agrees with Syr. ܠܟܐ *against* P.-S. הכא (=ܗܘܪܐ)[2]. The accus. particle ות, ית, in Zenjirli, Nab., and Palm. is rare in Syr., but particularly common in P.-S. Finally, we may add the plur. constr. in א- (No. 126 4), not to be confused with the plur. emph. as in תגרא (No. 113 3), and the defective spellings מודן, הון (Nos. 139, 147 i. 10).

The inscriptions have been carefully selected by Mr. Cooke, and he has succeeded in illustrating all the more distinctive classes. Nos. 8, 10, 29, 50–60, and

---

[1] In the note on 121 2 read ܡܘܬܒܐ Mt. xxiv. 3 ; [מ]יאת[ה]יתא, Vogüé No. 16 3, would closely resemble the Syr. form, but the restoration is doubtful.

[2] Hence on p. 279, second line from foot, read "Syr." for "Pal. Syr."

perhaps the two Zenjirli inscriptions, Nos. **61** and **62**, are scarcely suitable for beginners, but naturally their omission would have detracted from the value of the book. Between Nos. **66** and **67** a specimen of an Aramaic docket might very well have been inserted[1], and particularly in the Nabataean and Palmyrene divisions other inscriptions equally suitable for beginners might easily be suggested. In view of the necessity of keeping the book within limits this criticism would be unreasonable, and the only remark that may be made is that it would have been advantageous to record more thoroughly in the notes parallels or analogies from those inscriptions which are not cited in full[2]. · On the other hand, the excellent manner in which Mr. Cooke has condensed the most important details of the Punic inscriptions (see p. 137 sq.) deserves the highest praise.

Mr. Cooke has aimed not at originality by proposing new interpretations or reconstructions, but at as much finality as can be reached in the present state of knowledge. His object has been "to give, after careful study of the various authorities on the subject, what seemed to be the most probable verdict on the issues raised, and also to bring together the chief matters of importance bearing on the text." He refers to the frequent use of "probably" and "possibly" in the commentary, and he reminds us "how seldom we can speak with positiveness on questions of grammar and interpretation where the material is so limited and where there is no contemporary literature to shed light upon the monuments." True though these words are, it is well to remind ourselves also of the great progress of epigraphical research during the last decade. The accumulation of material, the greater interest taken in a critical study of the subject, and the tardy recognition of the fact

---

[1] e.g. CIS ii. 38, 39. Those preserved in the British Museum have recently been re-edited by J. H. Stevenson (*Vanderbilt Oriental Series*, 1902).

[2] In No. **116** 3 חככן can be illustrated by the Palm. עדרנן, &c. &c.

that the inscriptions are real contributions to Semitic philology and archaeology, have raised Semitic epigraphy to the rank of a separate branch of learning[1]. Further, although the decipherment of the inscriptions is not rarely attended with great obscurity, it is well to recollect that even in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, despite the assistance of tradition, of ancient versions, of vowels and accents, it is not seldom that one is unable to speak with confidence respecting points of philology or interpretation. Indeed, the words "probably" and "possibly" enter more frequently into the vocabulary of the Hebraist than is realized by some.

It is by reducing the limits of the possible and by ascertaining the extent of the probable—to follow Mr. Cooke—that we may hope to advance the study of North-Semitic epigraphy, and although in a great number of cases there is little disagreement of opinion, it is lamentable how frequently the true meaning of a line or group of words entirely escapes us, and how widely the views of editors will differ in the most striking manner one from the other.

The admirable manner in which Mr. Cooke has collected his material scarcely leaves anything to be desired. The thoroughness with which he has gone to work is made manifest in numberless instances[2], and if a note is missed here and there, we must remember that in a manual for students, completeness was neither possible nor perhaps even desirable—if the work was to be kept within limits. In a few cases, too, we may question whether Mr. Cooke has really adopted the best interpretation, and occasionally,

---

[1] As Mr. Cooke observes (p. viii) it is to Paris that the distinction belongs of having recognized the study of Oriental epigraphy and archaeology, by the foundation of a chair in the Collège de France. It is now held by M. Clermont-Ganneau, to whose brilliant studies every worker in this field is indebted.

[2] Slight though it is, in No. 12 (CIS i. 10), ll. 3 and 4 are rightly divided (לם | יכנש) in agreement with the facsimile in the *Corpus*, but by a mere slip the editors and Lidzbarski wrongly divide שלם | יכ.

also, the steady advance of epigraphic research places his observations in need of some qualification.

In ll. 11–12 of the Moabite stone, if the reading הקר‧ העם‧ כל is adopted, a note on the construction should be appended, cp. Ges.-Kau. § 127. The pregnant construction על אחז l. 14 deserves remark, cp. Deut. xx. 10. In l. 25 באסרי ישראל, point אֲסֻרֵי or אֲסִרֵי: in Biblical Hebrew אַסִּיר is used only in the singular. In ll. 8, 10 ארץ is used precisely as in 1 Sam. ix. 4, 8, &c., of a small district.

The Siloam inscription is confidently ascribed to about 700 B.C., but see below, p. 287.

To the note on 3 10 it is to be observed that the sing. אֵל "god" is now known not to be confined to proper names; in Costa, Nos. 16, 31, we meet with לאדן לאלן לבעל חמן and לאדן לאלן אקדש בעל חמן[1].

In the note on 5 4 it is not quite clear how Mr. Cooke actually interprets קנמי. The translation (p. 31) "I adjure," is based upon the Mishnic קונם, which is perhaps rather a minced oath, for קָרְבָּן[2], whereas, as a reflexive pronoun of the first person singular (Syr. ܡܩܡܘ), such a rendering is too elliptical (see p. 34). It will be observed that the translation "which I myself built" would excellently suit l. 4 (בנת קנמי), but is placed out of the question by the construction in l. 20, where we can scarcely suppose that it has been inserted by a careless copyist who, with l. 4 in his mind, took the word to belong to the sentence following. Still, this inscription is not free from errors, however slight (ll. 6, 9, 11).

In No. 9 4, an inscription of the second century from Umm el-'Awâmîd, there is a famous puzzle. In it 'Abd-elim vows "this gate and the doors: אשלפעלתבתכלתיבנתי in the year 180," &c. Mr. Cooke cites three interpretations: (a) and the doors "thereof (ל אש) I made (פעלת) in fulfilment of it (? ?); I built this (בנתי) in the year," &c. (b) "which (אש) are for the making (לפעלת) of the temple

---

[1] Lidz., *Ephemeris*, I, p. 39.

[2] See G. F. Moore, *Ency. Bib.*, "Vows," col. 5254.

(בת) I have finished (כלתי); I built it," &c. (c) "which I
have indeed made (לפעלת) in the completion of (בתכלתי) my
building." Against these may be urged תכלת "fulfilment"
in a; the bare בת and the verbal forms in b, and the affir-
mative ל in c (see also the note p. 47). Another rendering
is possible, (d) "which (אשל) I have made in its entirety
(בתכלתי); I built it in the year," &c. The unique אשל
which is thus postulated is not outrageous[1]; the suffix in
תכלת will of course refer to the erection of the gate and
doors as a whole.

It is not easy to rest content with the usual interpreta-
tion of No. 16 (CIS i. 46): "I 'Abd-osir, ... set up this
pillar in my life-time over my resting-place for ever; also
to my wife, . . ."

אנך · · · מצבת · למבחיי · יטנאת · על · משכב נחתי · לעלם · ולאשתי · ל· · ·[2]

Parallel to this, is No. 21: "This pillar which Arish ...
erected to his father ... and to his mother ... over their
resting-place, for ever."

מצבת אז אש יטנא · · · לאבי · · · ולאמי · · · על משכב נחתנם לעלם.

Not only have we in No. 16 "an exceptional instance of
the מצבת being set up by the person commemorated during
his life-time," but the combination of the prepositions
ל+מ+ב is most difficult. It is certainly true that in
No. 45 5 the *terminus a quo* may be understood, but this
does not suit No. 42 5. One might conjecture a particle
לם (cp. Syr. ܠܡ, late Heb. נמי), "even," but this is too
desperate a course. A proper name seems impossible.

In No. 27 (CIS i. 93) it is not improbable that
על בן בני is really "for the sons of his (Mar-Yehai's) son."
The genealogy is thus simplified. In No. 28, לענת עז חים
('Aθηνᾷ Σωτείρᾳ Nίκῃ) is usually rendered "To 'Anath the
strength of life," עז is thus derived from עזז (عزّ) be strong;
it is perhaps better to connect with עוז (عاذ) take refuge.

---

[1] See Wright, *Comp. Gram.*, p. 118.

[2] The dots indicate the omission of unnecessary words (chiefly proper-
names).

This inscription is of some interest on account of the name of the votary, Baal-shillem, son of Sesmai (Σέσμαος), which reminds us of Shallum b. Sismai (סִסְמָי) in the Jerahmeelite genealogy, 1 Chr. ii. 40. Curiously enough the name of Σέσμαος, a Sidonian, has recently been found upon graffiti in a tomb near Beit Jibrîn, at the site of the ancient Marêshah. The name Baal-shillem in No. 28 is replaced by Πραξίδημος, the reason for which is not obvious. Whilst on the subject of names it may be pointed out that the Greek Νουμήνιος not only represents בנחדש ("born on the new moon") No. 17 3, but, as a recently-discovered inscription proves, even מחדש[1]. That the familiar Punic מהרבעל (Μέρβαλος) is to be interpreted "gift of Ba'al" is certainly not convincing (p. 109); may one venture "Baal hastens"?[2] In No. 35, where אשמנשלם is represented by 'Εσυμσελήμου, the view that "the reduplication of the intensive stem (שִׁלֵּם) is not marked," does not seem to be very probable. Pi'el forms are easily recognizable in Balsillec and Βαλσιλλήχ (בעלשלך)[3]; the name under consideration was probably pronounced Eshmun-shalem. Mr. Cooke compares Δομσάλως = דעמצלח (No. 32), but here we doubtless have the same form as in מלכיתן (Cypriote mi-li-ki-ya-tho-no-se, CIS i. 89), cp. Hebrew forms like קָדוֹשׁ[4]. That יכנשלם (p. 57) means "peace be (to him)" cannot be regarded as certain in view of the Aramaic יכונעתה and the name of the Tyrian king 'Εκνίβαλος (? יכנבעל, Jos. c. Ap. i. 21).

אשמן מארח (No. 40) is another familiar difficulty. Eshumun-Aesculapius 'Ιατρός is perhaps meant, and the epithet מארח seems to be a denominative of אֲרֻכָה, "healing, restora-

---

[1] Répertoire d'Épigr. Sém., No. 388.

[2] One naturally recalls Maher-shalal-hash-baz (Isa. viii. 1, 3), which like Shear-Jashub is intended as an omen. These may be plays upon familiar personal names, cp. with Shear-Jashub such names as Shubael and Eliashib.

[3] Worn down to Βάσληχος in Jos. c. Apion. i. 21.

[4] May we compare the Sam. participial form קשׁוֹל? (Also Pal.-Syr. ܩܫܐ, Am. ix. 6 [ed. Margoliouth], if it is not rather a perf. in ō.)

tion"[1]. In a Sardinian inscription of the second century
this interchange of ח and כ is not too serious a difficulty.
In view of the late date, it does not seem plausible, more-
over, to explain the verbal form רפיא (" he healed him ") as
a verb treated after the manner of ל'ה, with the retention
of the radical י; יא– is preferably the later form of the
suffix (with י *plene*) as in the Neo-Punic אביא " his father."

The meaning and origin of דל in Phoenician is still exceed-
ingly obscure. (*a*) In the Marseilles sacrificial tablet (No.
42 15) allowance is made for the man דל מקנא אם דל צפר.
(*b*) In No. **46** 1 (CIS i. 175) the Decemviri renovate and
repair " this slaughter-house (מטבח) which is דל פעמם."
(*c*) In No. **45** reference is made to the sanctuaries and their
contents :—

<div dir="rtl">

דל מלכת החרץ ודל כל מנם · · · ודל העלם.

</div>

With the last citation we should possibly associate (*d*) the
Tabnith inscription (No. 4 4–5) :—

<div dir="rtl">

כאי אדלן כסף אי אדלן חרץ וכל מנם.

</div>

From *a* and *b* the meaning " devoid of," " without," has
been extracted. Obviously this suits neither *c* or *d*, nor is
it at all natural to render *b* " this slaughter-house without
steps," in spite of Exod. xx. 25, to which the Editors of
the *Corpus* refer. That דל in *a* is the Hebrew דַּל " poor "
seems extremely probable (see Cooke's note), and it is
very probable, also, that it is not connected with *b* and *c*.
As regards these, Lidzbarski has suggested " that which is
damaged," on the assumption that repairs are commemo-
rated (p. 128). Winckler's conjecture[2] that דל is to be
connected with the Assyrian *dullu* " work, workmanship "
is plausible enough to be added to the note on p. 128. On
the whole, however, since אדלן in *d* seems to contain some
such meaning as " with me " (see note on p. 29), I am
tempted to conjecture that in *b* and *c* דל is to be inter-
preted " together with," " including," or the like[3].

---

[1] Cp. Jer. xxxiii. 6 where it occurs together with רפא as above.

[2] See Lidzbarski, *Ephem.*, I, 301.

[3] Halévy (*Journ. Asiat.*, 1902, t. 20, p. 349 sq.), also, has identified אדל

In the note on No. 61 4 (יתנו) Mr. Cooke observes that in
the Zenjirli inscriptions and in those of Nêrab and Têma the
impf. pl. ends in *û*, not, as is usual in Aram., in *ûn*. It should
be observed, however, that the form, strictly speaking, is
peculiar to No. 61 (the Hadad inscr.), elsewhere it is always
a jussive, and the apocope of the נ is in accordance with
Biblical-Aramaic usage. In l. 34 of the Hadad inscription
תאלב (=תאלף) in parallelism with תחק is probably "put in
writing," cp. Nab. יתאלף (No. 79 7), but it is to be feared that
in the present state of our knowledge only a small amount
of probability can be attached to the interpretation of
Nos. 61 and 62.

In the note on 62 1 (fourth line) read ܠܚܫܒܘ. In No. 63,
l. 17, בית כלמו now appears to mean "house of Kalammu"
(above, p. 268, n. 2). That in l. 16 [ה]לישׁ is the older form of
לית seems very doubtful. In Bibl. Aram., even, the uncon-
tracted form לא איתי is usual, and the equation [ל]יש=later
Aram. ת[לי] would require an Arabic ليت. That the Aramaic
ܐܝܬ = Heb. יֵשׁ is not absolutely certain.

The difficult inscription from Petra (No. 94, CIS ii. 350)
must probably be recognized as dialectical. In l. 3 שארית כל
אצלא, summing up as it does everything relating to the
sepulchre, is most naturally rendered "the rest of all that is
near (it)." It is naturally connected with the Hebrew אֵצֶל
"near, beside," and it is worth noticing that both שארית, and
the form בארות (l. 2) are distinctly reminiscent of Hebrew.
Other peculiarities are the use of אנו "these," and תנא מקבר
"a contract to bury," for the usual כתב למקבר, כתב תקף, &c.
To render פפקדון (l. 4) "and it is the order," seems difficult
since פ' פאיתי would have been expected; it is quite in
keeping with the rest of the inscription to find פִּפְּקָדוֹן[1], but

and הו in *d*, *b* and *c*, and treats it as the Phoen. equivalent of the Heb.
עם. As regards the derivation, the Ass. *edîlu* "to bolt" might suggest
that (א)הד originally had the meaning "conjunction," "joining."

[1] In the note on p. 243 דכרון (CIS ii. 163, &c.) should have been cited, not
דכרן (only in 236) ; see above, p. 276.

a better rendering would be "and they (Dûshara, &c.) ordered"; cp. for the ending ‏ון-‏, Dalman, *Gram.*, p. 203, and ‏עבדון‏ on the Jewish-Aramaic mosaic of Kefr Kenna (*Pal. Explor. Fund, Quarterly Statement*, 1901, p. 376) [1].

In the Palm. inscr., No. **144**, we read : " in . . . the year 500 ; Lishamsh . . . has-given-a-share (‏אחבר‏) of this vault to Bônne . . . . I have-given-him-a-share (‏אחברתה‏)," &c. The change of person if not unique is extremely awkward here, and perhaps the simplest plan is to assume a mistake for the third person and read ‏אחבר לה‏ [2].

The valuable Tariff of Palmyra (No. **147**), among other noteworthy features, contains several examples of passives formed by internal vowel-change. These are recognized by Wright, Duval, Sachau, Bevan, Marti, and others, but Mr. Cooke denies their existence upon grounds which are open to criticism. In the first place, let it be admitted that the Nab. ‏אבני‏ (**102** 5) and Palm. ‏אשלמת‏ (Vogüé, 95 4) are too obscure to enter into the question; there remain then the examples in No. **147** and the Nab. inscr. from Medeba (No. **96**, l. 8). In the latter ‏ועבידתא די עלא עבידת‏ ‏בשנת וגו'‏ is correctly translated " and the above work *was executed* in the year," &c., but there is no note upon the form. As regards Mr. Cooke's objections (p. 334), it may be pointed out that it is extremely unlikely that the Biblical Aramaic ‏התקנת‏, ‏הוספת‏, &c., are modelled upon the Hebrew, and the statement that the forms are only used (in Bibl. Aram.) in the perf. 3rd pers. ignores ‏תְּקִלְתָּא‏ in Dan. v. 27 [3]. Finally, the difficulty of construing the

---

[1] To explain (‏א‏)‏צהוה‏, 94 2, 95 2, from the Arab. صُهْوَة is contrary to the usual equation, we should expect the initial letter to be ‏צ‏ ; a similar objection has been raised by Nöldeke against the identification of ‏רצוא‏ and ضُوَا‎, (88 1). In the case of ‏צהוה‏ a connexion with ضَوْءِ, to raise a monument, may be conjectured.

[2] Cp. *Proceedings of Society of Bibl. Archaeology*, 1899, p. 74.

[3] The note i. l. 13 (p. 335) assumes that ‏גְּלִי‏ is a passive participle. This is incorrect. Nowhere is the internal passive more clearly marked than in the forms ‏גְּלִי‏, ‏גְּלִי‏, ‏קְרִי‏ as distinct from the Pe'al partcp. pass. ‏בְּנֵה‏, ‏מָנֵא‏, ‏קְרֵי‏ (Wright, *Comp. Gram.*, p. 224 sq.). On p. 333, first line (the note on ‏לא אסקו‏), " Pual " is a slip for " Hophal."

Palmyrene forms as actives remains insuperable. Objection must be taken to the vocalization of certain forms in this inscription. The careful distinction between מָכְסָא "tax-gatherer," and מַכְסָא "tax" (p. 332), or between אַפְּקִי and אַפְּקִי (p. 333), is extremely useful; but such attempts as יִתְאֲיֵעל (p. 338, on l. 11), פְּלְהֶדְרוּתָא (p. 332, on l. 1) are of no service to the student, who might infer that they actually existed.

The sections on the North-Semitic coins, seals, and gems (Nos. 149, 150) are a welcome addition to the book, and may, we trust, lead to renewed research in this particular department. As regards the Jewish coins, Mr. Cooke accepts the view, now generally held, that those formerly attributed by Madden and others to Simon Maccabaeus belong to the period immediately preceding the fall of Jerusalem. They thus take their place midway between the Hasmonaean coins and those of the Second Revolt of 132–135 A. D.[1] These coins, extending as they do over a period of about 270 years[2], are of considerable palaeographic interest. Although marked as a whole by certain characteristic forms, it is worth noticing that of the specimens on p. 353, the third form of א is peculiar to the copper coins of the fourth year (p. 358 h 4) and the Second Revolt (132–135 A. D.), and the second form of ה is characteristic of the Hasmonaean period. The general appearance of the legends upon the coins of the First and Second Revolt differs to a marked degree from the Hasmonaean, whilst the carelessness which distinguishes those of Eleazar the priest is most remarkable.

The Jewish coins, as is well known, are stamped in the old Hebrew character, not in the Aramaic square forms which are to be found upon contemporary ossuaries, and ultimately came into general use. The script has several features in common with the Siloam inscription and

---

[1] Th. Reinach has quite recently returned to the older view, and a reconsideration of the question seems desirable (*Jewish Coins*, pp. 10–14).

[2] "170," p. 353, l. 3, is a misprint.

Mr. Pilcher has, on these grounds, proposed to place the latter at the close of the reign of Herod the Great [1]. The constructions מאתים ואלף אמה and מאת אמה (2 5–6) certainly suggest a date subsequent to the seventh century, and the evidence which assumes that the conduit, in which the inscription was discovered, was constructed by Hezekiah is far from being unimpeachable. Unfortunately, the history of Hebrew palaeography is very obscure, and in the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to fix the date with certainty. From the various seals and pottery stamps that have been found it would appear that in addition to a script closely resembling the Siloam, another was in use which approximated more closely to the Moabite and old Phoenician forms. No one can fail to observe that in the name צדקא (No. 150 6, Plate XI) both א and צ have Archaic shapes, differing from, and older than, those upon the Siloam inscriptions, and yet the seal, in conformity with the usual view, is dated in the seventh or sixth century. The subject is one upon which it is unnecessary to enter just now, and it will be enough if it is made evident how urgent is the need for inquiry [2]. The palaeography of the inscriptions, it may be mentioned, is treated only incidentally by Mr. Cooke, as is only fitting in a manual of this character, but some characteristic specimens are reproduced in the plates at the end, and these and the three tables of Alphabets will amply suffice to introduce the student to one of the most fascinating departments of Semitic study.

[1] *Proc. of Soc. of Bibl. Arch.*, 1897, p. 182.

[2] For the history of the Hebrew alphabet, the first requirement is *accurate* copies of the seals, &c. The following points then require to be considered : (*a*) the character of the proper names upon the seals, a careful distinction being drawn between Hebrew, Phoenician, and Aramaic names ; (*b*) the modification of the forms, viewed in connexion with the development of similar modifications in the Phoenician and Aramaic alphabets, for which dated evidence is more at hand ; (*c*) the archaeological evidence, where it can be obtained ; e. g. the strata at which the pottery stamps, &c. were found during the excavations of Bliss and Macalister in the Shĕphĕlah district.

The foregoing remarks and criticisms only affect points of detail, and in many cases merely reflect the writer's personal opinion. They in no wise detract from the excellence of Mr. Cooke's careful work. No one save those who have delved among the inscriptions and have striven to keep pace with the rapidly growing literature of the subject can fully appreciate the labour entailed in the collection of the material which is here placed at the disposal of Semitic students. Elaborate indexes render reference easy; one misses, however, an index of the inscriptions which are to be found in the *Corpus* and in such notable works as Euting's *Nabatäische Inschriften* or de Vogüé's *La Syrie Centrale.* If Lidzbarski performed a lasting service to scholars by rendering the inscriptions and their contents more readily accessible, the Rev. G. A. Cooke may be congratulated for his services in facilitating the study by removing most of the difficulties which had hitherto beset the path of the beginner.

How extensive the field of research, how urgent the need for workers and collaborators must be admitted by all. Whether it is the study of the philological peculiarities, or the palaeography, or the evidence of the proper names, or the Punic passages in the *Poenulus* of Plautus, or the religious ideas and beliefs—there is much that requires to be done. To Jews in particular the subject should be one of especial interest. It is surely important to familiarize oneself with dialects so closely related to Hebrew as Phoenician and Moabite. Surely it is useful to gain some acquaintance with ancient orthography and palaeography. Whatever may be our views of textual criticism, it is interesting to realize that some of the inscriptions themselves have come down to us with errors and mistakes, and if a stone, why not a MS. which has been copied and recopied?

The Egyptian-Aramaic documents in one case, at least, are Jewish, and the Oxford papyrus (pp. 404–6) contains the names of Jewish merchants and is evidence for the early settlement of Jews in Upper Egypt—possibly the

oldest allusion subsequent to Jer. xliv. 1, 15. The presence of Jews elsewhere may be suspected from the character of the proper names. In the Aramaic dockets we meet with such familiar forms as יבחראל; בעלעזר, מנחם, אלמלך, הושע; among the graffiti in the Sinaitic peninsula there appear שבתי, חיאל and רמאל; Palmyra numbered among her inhabitants ברק, שמעון, and מרתי (Martha).

For the religion of the Semites the inscriptions are a storehouse of material. The Phoenician sacrificial tablets (Nos. 42–44) are of interest as much for their divergence from, as their agreement with, Hebrew ritual. The importance of the Moabite stone, with its mention of the divine name יהוה, has already been mentioned. In Palmyrene, the god ʿAzīzu is called רחמנא "the *compassionate* one," an epithet which is found upon votive inscriptions dedicated "to Him whose Name is Blessed"; the phrases—like the Palmyrene מרא עלמא "Lord of the World" (*or* "of eternity")—sound peculiarly Jewish (pp. 296 sqq.). Even בעלשמם "Lord of the Heavens"—I need not stop to refer to Jewish analogies—is rendered in bilingual inscriptions by Ζεὺς ὕψιστος, a suggestive indication of the growth of monotheistic ideas, and of a reaction against polytheism.

<div style="text-align:right">STANLEY A. COOK.</div>